

Reevaluation of "1's" (All for "Accuracy" -
No "1's" given for "Value")

<u>Doc</u>	<u>RV</u>	<u>Comment</u>	<u>Final</u> <u>Assessment</u>	<u>SG1J</u>	<u>SG1J</u>
97	A				
90	B		"	"	
85	C	Evaluator says "1" is "vague" - info is very general	"	"	
84	A	Actually A & C given 1's on this one - veto	"	"	
72	A	"Right on target" - but no specifics as to what that means.	"	"	
				SG1J	
94	A	High accuracy evaluators may reflect info from ^{readily available press articles}			
93	C	" " "	"	"	
92	C	" " "	"	"	
				SG1I	
82	C	I think evaluator had to "stretch" to get a "1"			
81	B	Evaluator's comments would not justify a "1"			
79	C	" " " " "			

Of total evaluations, i.e., $6 \times 33 = 198$, only 157 filled in (need to add 104 & 103 if possible). Of those: 79 V's have no "1's",
 78 A's have 10 "1's" but 3 are result of ^{repeating} press info (92, 93, 94),
 1 is "vague" (85) and 3 are inconsistent w/ evaluator's
 subsequent comments. Only 3 - all from same
 evaluator however, seem to warrant the marking
 without (other than ^{possible} evaluator bias to ^{evaluate} _{RV} remarks
 in most positive light)